

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2005 in which Claims 29-39 and 41-65 were withdrawn; in which Claims 25-28 were objected to; and in which Claims 1-24 and 40 were rejected. With this response, withdrawn Claims 29-39 and 41-65 are cancelled; objected to Claim 25 is cancelled with its limitations incorporated into rejected Claim 1; Claims 1, 26, 27 and 40 are amended; and Claims 69-74 are added. Claims 1-24, 26-28, 40 and 66-74 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-15, 18, 20, 22-24 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Aligner.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-9, 11-15, 18, 20, 22-24 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Aligner et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/1070175. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 18, 20, 22-24 and 40, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Aligner and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

A. Claim 1.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action indicated that dependent Claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Claim 25 is cancelled and its limitations are incorporated into its base Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Aligner. Claims 2-9, 11-15, 18, 20 and 22-24 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 40.

Page 6 of the Office Action indicated that Claims 25-28 were allowable because the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the formation of a protective material between a floor of the trench pattern and an opposite portion of the micro device wafer. With this response, Claim 40 is amended to recite the step of providing a protective material between a floor of the trench pattern and an

opposite portion of the micro device wafer as presently recited in Claim 25. Accordingly, Claim 40, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Aligner and is in condition for allowance.

II. Rejection of Claims 10, 16, 17, 19 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Aligner.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejected Claims 10, 16, 17, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aligner et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/1070175. Claims 10, 16, 17, 19 and 21 each depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection based upon Aligner for the same reason discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

III. Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 66-74 are added. Claims 66-74 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claims 66 and 68.

Claims 66-68 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional features which further patentably distinguish such claims over the prior art of record. Claim 66 recites that the protective material extends between adjacent seals. Claim 67 recites that the protective material extends over contact points while not extending over main portions of the micro device. Claim 68 recites that the protective material is a polyvinyl acetate. Thus, Claims 66-68 are presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claims 69-74.

Added Claims 69-74 depend from Claim 40 and recite additional features which further patentably distinguish such claims over the prior art of record. Claims 69-71 substantially correspond to Claims 26-28 while Claims 72-74 substantially correspond to Claims 66-68, respectively. Thus, added Claims 69-74 are presented for consideration and allowance.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-24, 26-28, 40 and 66-74 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Dec. 21, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276